asked to give the guarantee of return and if so, have they given the guarantee?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—No guarantee has been asked for. The estimate itself has not been sanctioned. We have simply asked for a load survey being made and that has been done.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—Has not the Deputy Commissioner taken *mutchalikas* from the concerned local bodies agreeing to give the guarantee?

Mr. M. G. MEHKRI.—Government have not received any information on that point.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—Are the Government aware that His Highness the late Maharaja, on the occasion of his visit to Kolar in connection with the electrification of the town, was pleased to say that he would like to see lights provided in all the villages?

The MINISTER for LAW (Rajasevaprasakta A. V. Ramanathan).—Even now the Government have that object before them. But it is not practicable to take such schemes on hand at present. So far as the present question is concerned, the member knows that on account of the war the necessary electrical materials are not available. So there is no use of pursuing questions on the matter.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—Cannot the materials be manufactured locally?

Mr. A. V. RAMANATHAN.—Copper wire, etc., cannot be manufactured locally.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—Are not Government supplying electricity to other places when the anticipated return is even less?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—It has been the idea of Government to give lights to as many places as possible without particular reference to the adequacy of the return from the schemes. But, if necessary materials are not available, what can be done?

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Is the return of 10 per cent, that is expected, gross or net?

Mr A. V. RAMANATHAN.—Ordinarily a gross return of 10 per cent is expected. But if long distances are involved and the working expenses themselves come to a high figure, at least those expenses have to be covered. These are the general principles governing the sanction of electrical schemes. But just now, on account of the war, the necessary materials are not available. In the circumstances, nothing can be done in the matter for some time to come.

Remission of Wet Assessment on Lands below Kempanapura Tank.

Q.—155. **Mr. M. CHIKKALINGAPPA** (Chamarajnagar—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) how many acres of wet and garden lands are irrigated by the water of the Kempanapura tank in Chamarajnagar taluk;

(*b*) whether it has come to their notice that this tank is in a dilapidated condition for over a period of 23 years and that no crop (wet) is being grown;

(*c*) the number of applications received by the Government to set right this tank and whether it is not a fact that land revenue at wet rates is collected though the tank does not supply the water necessary for wet crops;

(*d*) whether they are aware of any promise given by them to the villagers to set right the tank;

(*e*) whether they will be pleased to order remission of the wet rate till the tank is repaired and made useful to those who hold land in that *atchkat* and also order the refund of the excess of wet rate collected till to-day?

A.—**The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprasakta B. T. Kesaviengar).**—

(*a*) The *atchkat* under the tank is 141 *acres* and 18 *guntas*.

(*b*) Yes.

(*c*) The number of petitions received cannot be easily ascertained. Remission of half wet assessment on the *atchkat* lands is being granted every year since 1935-36.

(*d*) No.

(*e*) Remission will be granted under the rules.

Mr. M. CHIKKALINGAPPA.—Is it not possible to restore the tank?

Mr. B.T. KESAVAIENGAR.—It is in an inam village and the consent of the concerned *Kayamguttadar* has to be obtained.

Mr. M. CHIKKALINGAPPA.—Will his consent be obtained ?

Mr. B.T. KESAVAIENGAR.—We shall make necessary enquiries in the matter.

Mr. M. CHIKKALINGAPPA.—Prior to 1935-36, for well-nigh 18 years, full wet assessment was collected though the tank did not supply the water necessary for wet cultivation. Will the amount so collected be refunded ?

Mr. B.T. KESAVAIENGAR.— Prior to 1935-36, it was under the management of the *inamdar* and so it is not possible to say whether the assessment collected would be refunded.

Mr. M. CHIKKALINGAPPA.— When Government have been giving remissions in respect of the same lands since 1935-36, is it not just that for the previous years also it should be given ? Will the *inamdar* be consulted in the matter ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—We will enquire.

Mr. B. S. VENKATANAGAPPA SETTY.—If applications for the grant of remission in respect of the previous years are sent, will they be considered ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—I cannot give any considered answer just now because, as stated by me already, the tank was under the management of the *inamdar* prior to 1935-36.

Mr. M. N. JOIS.—Cannot Government themselves arrange to give remissions in respect of the previous years also ?

The MINISTER for REVENUE and FINANCE (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman).— It all depends upon the relationship subsisting and agreements entered into between the *inamdar* and the raiyats in the previous years.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.— Is the cultivation below the tank wet or dry now ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—Dry.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.— If so, is it just to levy even half the wet assessment ?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The rules permit of a remission of only half the wet assessment.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.— Are not the rules defective in regard to this particular matter ? Will the Government obviate the palpable injustice ?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—The question was considered in 1934 by the Agriculturists Relief Committee and on their recommendation Government amended the Land Revenue Code providing for the grant of relief in deserving cases.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.— I was a member of the Committee and I believe that the question of only temporary relief came before it. There was no suggestion about giving permanent relief. I would be obliged if the matter is kindly looked into once again.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—That is a general question and does not arise in connection with the supplementary questions.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.— Even in the question under discussion the point is that when dry crops only are being raised under the dilapidated tank, only dry assessment must be taken and not half the wet assessment.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—There are two categories of tanks : one is, those tanks which are breached but are likely to be restored soon ; the other is, those tanks which are not likely to be restored for a long time. In respect of the former, the rules permit of remission of half the wet assessment. But in respect of the latter the question of remission is dealt with differently.

Mr. S. I. MUMTAZ.—As the rules relating to remission cannot in fairness be applied to lands below breached tanks, will they be modified suitably ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—That is not a supplementary question.

Mr. S. I. MUMTAZ.—Why not only dry rates be levied under breached tanks ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—It is not usual to levy dry rates.

Mr. S. I. MUMTAZ.—In future at least will they be levied ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I cannot say that at present.

Mr. N. RAMA RAO.—In reply to a question by Mr. Chengalaraya Reddy it was stated that half the wet assessment

would be remitted in respect of lands below tanks which are likely to be restored. If only half the wet assessment is collected, will it not raise a hope that the tanks are going to be restored ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Yes, and the hope is shared by Government also.

Mr. N. RAMA RAO.—If the tank is not restored, should not the difference between the dry rate and half the wet rate be refunded ?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I do not understand why.

Mr. N. RAMA RAO.—It seems to me a matter of simple arithmetic.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—Rather it is arithmetic and equity.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—I would like to know from Mr. Chikkalingappa whether the tank exists now and if so whether water from the channel is flowing into it ?

Mr. M. CHIKKALINGAPPA.—There is the tank but it is in an unrestored condition. No water is flowing into it from the channel.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—According to rules, in cases where the tank is, for all practical purposes, abandoned for an indefinite period and no wet crops have been raised under it for three successive years, a temporary assessment at the maximum dry rates prevailing may be levied as *bengar kandayam*, the balance of wet assessment being remitted.

Mr. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—I think that was the order of the Government on the committee's recommendation. The recommendation itself was that under breached tanks, half wet assessment should not be collected but only dry assessment should be levied. But Government said that if it was only for a few years that no wet crops were raised, half the assessment would be collected and if no wet crops were raised for a long period, a maximum dry assessment would be recovered. What I wish to know is whether even in the latter type of cases, the Government are collecting only dry assessment.

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—But in the case under reference, in the previous years the tank was under the *inamdar's* management. What can be done now ?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—I think we may as well reserve these matters of general importance for discussion for another occasion.

Entry of Harijans into Muzrai Temples.

Q.—156. **Mr. ISCOOLAPPA** *alias* **MUNISAMAPPA** (Kolar—Rural).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether there is any rule prohibiting the Harijans from entering the temples under the management of the Muzrai Department in the Mysore State ;

(*b*) if so, the reason ?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. J. Appaji Gowda).**—

(*a*) and (*b*) Immemorial custom or usage having the force of law.

Mr. M. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Have the Government passed a law to enable Harijans to enter certain institutions into which they had no entry formerly ?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—No.

Mr. M. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Have they not thrown open general schools to Harijan pupils ?

M. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—That was by an executive order.

Mr. M. HANUMANTHAIYA.—Similarly, why not Harijans be permitted to enter the temples ?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—The question of entry into the temples stands on a different footing altogether. Worship there is conducted according to *Agama sastras* and any interference with it may wound the religious susceptibilities of particular classes of people.

Mr. T. S. RAJAGOPALA IYENGAR.—How many temples are there under the management of the Muzrai Department ?

Mr. J. APPAJI GOWDA.—Several thousands.

Mr. T. S. RAJAGOPALA IYENGAR.—Are not grants from general funds given to them ?

The MINISTER for REVENUE and FINANCE (Rajamantrapravina K. V Anantaraman.)—Yes.

Mr. T. S. RAJAGOPALA IYENGAR.—Do *sastras* definitely prohibit the entry of Harijans into temples ?